



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

Vol. XXVII, 1.

WHOLE No. 105.

---

## I.—THE USE OF THE OPTATIVE IN THE EDDA.

This paper attempts to list in convenient groups all the occurrences of the optative in the poems of the Eddas. Some discussion has been necessary to explain the grouping of examples, and some remarks have arisen from the necessity of noticing important or rare usages. An attempt has also been made to give, by way of comparison, the useful facts regarding the other moods. Except for this, all discussions, including theories as to origins, have been cut to the briefest possible compass.

The classification here adopted was not chosen because of any belief that it was the only good one for the treatment of the facts in hand. Perhaps it was not the best one for the purpose. In fact this system was originally called forth by the conditions that prevailed in the older languages of the Indo-European group. There may be danger in applying it to the syntax of a language like Old-Icelandic, where not only have modal forms become quite limited in number, but even modal meanings have evidently changed much since their first representatives made their appearance in the literature of the older languages; narrowing here, widening there, now dropping outworn connotations, now forming new associations, until new distinctions are certainly called for. If, therefore, this system is applied under these new conditions, it must be used with such freedom that new categories, and even perhaps new, re-formed 'grundbegriffe', are candidly recognized, if necessary. However, since science is so incurably monistic, the adoption of one system for the grouping of the related facts of all the Indo-European languages is inevitable.<sup>1</sup> A certain inverted method

<sup>1</sup> I fully appreciate the contention of Jespersen as put forth in *Engl. Studien*, Vol. 35, p. 7, but Comparative Syntax has its own just claims.

is too prevalent. The modal treatment of the older languages has suffered much from categories imposed by conceptions gained in daily intercourse with such modern languages as can still display what seems to be a respectable array of veteran modal usages; which, however, prove to be only the disorganized remnants of a rapidly retreating rearguard almost ready to break into flight and vanish out of sight. Hence there is so much of 'souverän' and 'polemisch', 'absolut' and 'relativ', 'tatsächlich' and 'vorstellung' in treating moods of languages that have preserved clearly distinguishable modal conceptions. It is obviously safer and more scientific to ask Old-Icelandic to submit to the general categories furnished by the older languages than to make the converse demand, provided of course the facts be never misread or misinterpreted to suit the categories.

Nygaard, Gering and Delbrück have been particularly serviceable in the preparation of this paper. Besides two early <sup>1</sup>programs on Syntax of the Eddas, which treat mainly of case usage, Nygaard gives a series of four articles in the <sup>2</sup>Arkiv for Nordisk Filologi (Vol. I-III), which, however, are based almost entirely on prose usages. This work, together with Gering's Wörterbuch zu den Liedern der Edda, Halle, 1903, furnishes the data for the part devoted to Old-Icelandic in Delbrück's recent article on <sup>3</sup>Der Germanische Optativ im Satzgefüge, which has antiquated all previous studies. As this article of Delbrück's should and, no doubt, will form a basis for future work in Germanic modal syntax, it is unfortunate that in discussing Old-Icelandic its author did not have at his disposal a treatment of the earlier poetic usages; for many important data thereby escaped his notice, some inaccuracies became inevitable, and some conclusions that are drawn are fallible because of the incompleteness of the evidence upon which they are based. The existence of Gering's excellent Wörterbuch has rendered it possible to cut my study down to the present small compass, by frequent references to him for complete lists of examples, as, e. g., under *ef*, *nema*, *sem*, etc. I have used 'Sijmons' text, and have listed all the examples found there, not only in the poems but also in the prose remarks, and in the fragments.

<sup>1</sup> Nygaard, Edda Sprogets Syntax, 1867-9.

<sup>2</sup> Nygaard, Om brugen af Konjunktiv i Oldnorsk, Arkiv f. Nord. Fil. I-III.

<sup>3</sup> In Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Deutschen Spr. u. Lit., 1904, p. 200-304.

<sup>4</sup> B. Sijmons, Die Lieder der Edda, Halle, 1888-1901.

## I. THE OPTATIVE IN INDEPENDENT CLAUSES.

1. *In expressions of will.*

I find no examples in the Edda of the independent volitive in the *first person* singular or plural. *Resolve* on the part of the speaker is usually expressed by the first person singular of *skolo*, while *exhortation*, which involves both the speaker and the listener, is regularly expressed by the first person plural of the imperative, e. g.,

*göngom* baug sea! 'let us go see the rings', Vkv. 23<sup>4</sup>.

Examples of the optative in the *second person* in commands are not numerous:

*röþomk þér*, Loddśafner, en (*at R*) þū *röþ nemer*, 'I caution thee, take thou my advice', Hōv. 111<sup>1</sup>, ff. This formula occurs more than twenty times between Hōv. 110 and Hōv. 136.

*ræþk þér nū*, en þū *rāþ nemer*, ok *rīþ heim heþan*, Fm. 20. Notice that the optative is immediately followed by the imperative (*rīþ*), which mood is of course the regular one in direct commands. The following three verbs are perhaps felt to be semi-dependent:

*skōsmiþr þū veser nē skeptesmiþr*, 'Be thou neither cobbler nor spearsmith', Hōv. 125<sup>4</sup>;

*gest þū nē geyja nē ā grind hrökkver*, Hōv. 134<sup>4</sup>;

*sīþr þū hefner*, Sd. 22<sup>3</sup>. In the next, the verb is independent, but the reading is uncertain:

*svā komer* (komit A) *manna meirr aptr ā vit*, Vegt. 14<sup>2</sup>.

The third person, singular and plural, is frequently used in commands and expressions of will. It may be noticed that a majority of the verbs in this list have an indefinite subject like *maþr* or *enge*. This is wholly accidental and due to the large number of proverbial prescriptions in such poems as the Hōvamōl. Fifteen verbs are in the affirmative, eleven in the negative:

*halde* Hel *pvīs hefer!* 'Let Hel keep her possessions', F. M. 5<sup>15</sup>;

*ligge* okkar enn *ī mille*, Sg. 67<sup>1</sup>;

*höfþe skemra, lāte hann . . . fara til heljar heþan*, Fm. 34<sup>1</sup>; 38<sup>1</sup>;

*hāfe et mikla men Brīsinga!* Þrk. 14<sup>4</sup>;

*haldet* maþr ā kere, *drekke þō at hōfe mjōþ, māle þarft eþa þege*, 'Let the cup go 'round, yet drink thy share of the mead; speak fair or not at all!' Hōv. 19<sup>1-2</sup>;

nē ān til kynnes *kome*, Hōv. 33<sup>2</sup>;  
 meþalsnotr skyle manna hverr, æva til snotr *sē* Hōv. 54<sup>2</sup>;  
 55<sup>2</sup>; 56<sup>2</sup>;  
*ørlog* sin *vite* enge fyrer Hōv. 56<sup>3</sup>;  
 þvegenn ok metr *rīpe* maþr þinge at, Hōv. 61<sup>1</sup>;  
 skua ok brōka *skammesk* enge maþr, Hōv. 61<sup>3</sup>;  
 akre ārsōnom *true* enge maþr, Hōv. 87<sup>1</sup>;  
*verpet* maþr svā tryggr, Hōv. 88<sup>4</sup>;  
*letea* maþr hana langrar gōngo, Sg. 45<sup>3</sup>;  
*bregpe* enge fōsto heite fira, Alv 3<sup>4</sup>;  
 mæle þarft eþa þege, Vm. 10<sup>2</sup>.

Plural:

*sē* nū segger, Gpr. III, 8<sup>3</sup>; *tjalde* of borg þā tjoldom, Sg. 65<sup>1</sup>;  
*brinne* mer enn hunska ā hliþ aþra, Sg. 65<sup>4</sup>; 66<sup>1</sup>;  
*rinne* rōkn bitloþ, H. H. I. 53<sup>1</sup>; *firresk* æ forn røk firar,  
 Ls. 25<sup>4</sup>.

The appropriate form of *skolo* with the infinitive frequently serves as an equivalent of the volitive. This *skolo* is in turn softened into an optative, partly through the leveling influence of the other verbs, partly through a desire to break the brusqueness of an abrupt *þū skal* or *maþr skal*. Cf. Hōv. passim, where all of these means are used and seem to be almost interchangeable; e. g., meþalsnotr *skyle* manna hverr, æva til snotr *sē*, Hōv. 54; and vin sīnom *skal* maþr vinr vesa . . . en ðvinar sīns *skyle* enge maþr vinar vinr vesa, Hōv. 43. (Cf. what is said about *skolo* in the treatment of the potential optative.)

## 2. In expressions of wish.

First person:

vel ek, kvaþ Völundr, *verpak* ā fitjom, 'bless me! could I but come to my feet once more', Vkv. 30<sup>3</sup>.

*knegak* grame fagna, 'would I could greet my lord!' H. H. II. 35<sup>5</sup> (or does it depend upon *nema*? Gering's interpretation, "wie grüsst ich ihn froh!" is hardly possible, as the present optative is not so used in the Eddas. Sijmons brackets the line.) Both of these verbs are on the borderland of the 'unreal', for they express wishes that obviously cannot be fulfilled. In the preterite I find sea þat *mættak*, at sēr nē ynþet, 'would I could see!' Am. 54<sup>4</sup>; also *knættak* coördinated with *mundak* in H. H. II. 21<sup>3</sup>: lifna *mundak* nū kjōsa es liþner 'o, ok *knættak* þō þer i faþme felask. The periphrasis with *munda* seems in fact to be at least as regular as the simple optative. Besides the example just quoted there are the following:

hēr mundak øple una, Fj. 5<sup>4</sup>;

heima letja ek *munda* Herjafoþor, Vm. 2<sup>1</sup>.

Second person:

heill þū *farer*! heill þū aþr *komer*! heill þū ā sinnom *sēr*!  
'farewell in thy going, farewell in thy coming, farewell on thy way', Vm. 4;

at undrsjōnom þū *verþer*! Skm. 28<sup>1</sup>.

vīþkunnare þū *verþer* an vōrþr meþ goþom, Skm. 28<sup>4</sup>. (Note that in the long curse of Skm. 25-37, Skirnir finds *skal* quite as serviceable as the optative. At times the former contains a greater degree of certainty, but again it seems to serve almost as the equivalent of the latter.) The imperative is also serviceable in expressing wishes: *vesþū* sem þistell, Skm. 31<sup>3</sup>; þū, Fāfner, *ligg* ī fjōrbrotom! Fm. 21<sup>3</sup>. I find one instance of the second person plural present of the optative in a wish:

svā ēr lȳþom lande ī *eyþeþ*, sem of unnoþ eiþa svarþa, Gþr I. 20<sup>1</sup>.

Third person singular:

matr *sē* þēr leiþare, 'be thy meat more loathsome', Skm. 27<sup>3</sup>.  
*sile* hann ā auþe, *sofe* hann ā dūne, *vake* hann at vilja, 'may he sit in wealth, may he sleep on a bed of down, may he awake when it pleases him', Grt. 5<sup>4</sup>; *rinnea* sā marr es und þēr rinne, *bitea* þat sverþ es þū bregþer, 'may the horse you ride stand still, may the sword you carry refuse to cut', H. H. II. 30-1; *hare*, Skm. 28<sup>2</sup>; *griþe*, *morne*, Skm. 31<sup>3</sup>; *lette*, Grt. 17<sup>2</sup>; *vaxe*, H. Hv. 16<sup>4</sup>; *sē*, Gþr. I. 22<sup>2</sup>; Gg. 14<sup>2</sup>; *njōte*, Hōv. 137; *fare*, *eige*, Am. 31<sup>4</sup>; *gange*, Akv. 32<sup>1</sup>; *leike*, *brinne*, Ls. 65<sup>4</sup>; *skriþea*, H. H. II. 30<sup>1</sup>; gramer *hafe* Gunnar, Br. 11<sup>3</sup>; *ōþe* þēr *duge*, Vm. 4<sup>3</sup>; *hverfe*, *snuesk*, Gg. 9<sup>3</sup>; *meget*, *halde*, Gg. 12<sup>3</sup>; *standet*, Gg. 15<sup>2</sup>; *mege* brenna, Ghv. 21<sup>3</sup>; hēr *skyle* enge granda, Grt. 6<sup>1</sup>. (The wish is expressed by the 'modest' optative of *skal*. cf. Od. 30<sup>2</sup>; H. H. II. 29; Gþr. II. 9<sup>3</sup>.)

Plural:

urþar lokor *halde* þēr øllom megom, 'Guarding charms keep thee on all sides!' Gg. 7<sup>3</sup>; *eige* hann jōtnar, 'may the giants take him', Am. 30<sup>3</sup>; *vaxe* þēr tōr, Skm. 29<sup>2</sup>; *gefe*, Skm. 36<sup>2</sup>; svā *hjalpe* þēr, Od. 8<sup>1</sup>; *deile* grōm vīþ þik, H. H. I. 46<sup>4</sup>; þiþne sorger, Ghv. 21<sup>4</sup>; *batne*, *minke*, Ghv. 22<sup>2</sup>; *gange*, *lē*, Gg. 11<sup>3,4</sup>; *snuesk* *verre*, Gg. 8<sup>4</sup>.

3. In questions.

The optative is also found in some questions of perplexity and the like. Delbrück is inclined to consider these as belonging to

the potential optative (Beiträge, 29; p. 206). In so interpreting hvī *megi* svā vera, 'wie kann es so sein?' Mork, 97, 17, is he not reading the meaning of *megi* into the interpretation of the mood? However, the examples seem to depend largely upon the context for exact interpretation, so that it would be unjust to force them into any one class. Suffice it to say that there are enough to form a recognizable type. hvī of *segjak* þēr . . . mikenn möþtrega', 'why should I (or how can I) tell you my great sorrow?' Skm. 4; hvē umb þreyjak þriar, 'how shall I (or how can I) wait three days?' Skm. 43<sup>2</sup>; hvī *mynem* hēr vilja heyra ā þā skrækton? Am. 60<sup>4</sup>; hvat *mege* fōtr fōte veita? Hm. 13<sup>1</sup>.

This type is probably a close relative of the Indo-European subjunctive and optative questions that usually appear in the first person. Such questions are usually classed as of volitive and optative ('prescriptive') origin.

Before giving the examples of the independent potential optatives I shall list the dependent clauses of will and wish. As it is neither possible nor very essential to keep these clearly distinguished, I shall classify in whatever way the examples may be made most accessible for general use.

## II. THE OPTATIVE IN DEPENDENT CLAUSES OF WILL AND DESIRE.

1. *Final clauses after at, at eige, svā-at, sīþr.* The optative is the regular mood.

### *Present tense.*

friþ at kaupa at þū þēr Frey *kveþer* öleiþastan lifa, 'to buy your favor so that you will call Frey your lover', Skm. 19<sup>3</sup>; lát svā breiþa borg ā velle at und oss öllom jafnrūmt see, Sg. 64<sup>4</sup>; gelk þēr . . . at. þū of öxl *skjöter*, Gg. 6<sup>3</sup>; sitka svā sæl . . . at *unak* lifa, H. H. II. 35<sup>2</sup>; at veita svāt . . . *hafa*, Hdl. 9; ber minnesöl . . . svāt öll *mune* orþ at tina, Hdl. 46<sup>2</sup>; gelk þēr . . . at þvi firr (=quominus) *mege*, Gg. 13<sup>3</sup>; gøra goll fagrt svāt gaman þykke, Gþr. II. 27<sup>2</sup>; upp lita skalattu . . . sīþr þik of *heille* haler, Hðv. 128<sup>6</sup>; lát ulfs fōþor sitja sumbla at, sīþr oss Loke *kveþe*, Ls. 10<sup>3</sup>; mar ok mæke gefk þēr . . . sīþr þū ösom öfund of *gjalder*, Ls. 12<sup>3</sup>; tak vīþ hrīmkalke . . . *heldr* ('so that at least') þū hana *läter* vesa, Ls. 53<sup>3</sup>; þik vilk fregna unz alkunna, Vgtm. 8, 10, 12.

*Preterite tense.*

bupom vit bauga at þeir *eige* til Atla *segþe*, Od. 24<sup>2</sup>; gættesk þess Høgne at ārna ānaupgom at undan *genge*, Am. 60<sup>2</sup>; mæler þū at munz rāþe svāt mēr *skyld*e verst þykkja, Hrbl. 124; svornom eiþom sīþr *vārak* heitenn hans kvānar vin, Sg. 28<sup>2</sup>; lips þins *vārak* þā þurfe at ek *helda* þeire . . . mey, Hrbl. 94;

2. *Substantive clauses of will and desire.*

a) with *biþja*. The optative is required.

sendu æsir at biþja at Baldr *vaeri* grātinn, 'they sent messengers to request that Balder be mourned', F. M. 5; biþk þik at þū Heþne hvilo *gørver*, ok jōfor ungan ōstom *leiþer*, H. Hv. 41<sup>3, 4</sup>; biþja at æ viþ þik einart *lāte*, Hdl. 4<sup>2</sup>; biþja at mēr einn *gefe*, Ls. 6<sup>3</sup>; beþet mik at *tyggva*, Gpr. II. 41<sup>4</sup>; biþk þik at þū Loka *kveþera* lastastōfom, Ls. 16; biþja ykr at it ā bekk *kōmeþ*, Akv. 3<sup>3</sup>;

baþ sonu sīna at þeir *bæþi*, Dr. 14; baþ þik at sārdropa svefja *skylder*, H. H. II. 41<sup>5</sup>.

b) with *rāþa*. The optative is almost always found.

þat rāþk þēr et fyrsta at þū vammalaust *veser*, 'I give you this advice that you be guileless', Sd. 22<sup>2</sup>. So *nē sverer*, Sd. 23<sup>2</sup>; *bjarger* Sd. 33<sup>2</sup>; *truer*, Sd. 35<sup>2</sup>; *seer*, Sd. 37<sup>2</sup>; [Note that in this passage, the construction is very loose so that an imperative (*at deilet*, Sd. 24), and an indicative (*at skalt*, Sd. 32) are admitted.] þa's i rāþe at regen of þrjōte, Hdl. 44<sup>4</sup>; rōþomk þēr at (en?) þū rōþ *nemer*, Hōv. 111<sup>2</sup>;

rēþ þat at *skyld*e taka hana, Ghv. 7, þū þvī rētt *es* ek rīþa skyldak, Fm. 30<sup>1</sup>.

c) with *vilja*. The indicative does not occur.

vill þū at ek fleire *telja*? 'Do you wish me to tell more'? Ls. 28<sup>1</sup>; þat vill enge maþr at vit samt *seem*, Skm. 7<sup>4</sup>; vilkak at it vreīþr *vegesk*, Ls. 18; ef þū vill at mange þēr heiptom *gjalde* harm, Sd. 11<sup>4</sup>; viljak at mēr horn *bere*, Grm. 36<sup>1</sup>; viltu at ek fyr *telja*? Vsp. 1<sup>3</sup>; (sine *at*) ef þū vill, annars kvæn vēlet þik i trygþ, Sd. 7; (vilnask) vilnomk at viþ Vōlund *dōmak*, Vkv. 33<sup>4</sup>;

nē vildak þat at mik verr *ætte*, Sg. 35<sup>1</sup>; vilda at *rēþak*, Gpr. II. 39<sup>2</sup>.

d) With other verbs and expressions of will and wish. hon bad konung *varask at eigi fyrgørþi* honum, Grm. 22; *boþ sende at kvēme* brátt māgar, Am. 2<sup>4</sup>; norn *skōpomk* i ārdaga at *skyldak* i vatne vaþa, Rm. 2<sup>4</sup>; *mælte* at Sigmundr *skyldi* fara fyr. Sf. 22.



The governing word is understood from the context in the next two: *at þik þjófar nē leiðe*, Hǫv. 130<sup>6</sup>; *at flotbrúsa fester okkarn*, Hym. 27<sup>2</sup>.

e) Substantive clauses of fear with *ðask*. The indicative does not occur. *ek hitt oomk at hēr ute sē minn brōþorbane*, Skm. 16<sup>3</sup>; *oomk ek of Hugan at hann aptr nē kome*, Grm. 20<sup>3</sup>.

f) There is a miscellaneous lot of substantive clauses that do not so easily betray their source. Some, when resolved into paratactic form, seem to be volitives, e.g.: *þat's bazt at hann þege*, 'tis best he hold his peace', Hǫv. 27<sup>2</sup> (cf. indic. after *bazt at*, Hǫv. 14<sup>3</sup>); *esa þat hōft at þū skyler*, kveþja Fāfne fear, 'it's not fitting that you should', Rm. 12<sup>3</sup>. (Note how *skolo* assumes the burden of giving the modal feeling that the verb itself could still bear, as is evident enough in the preceding example. Not only so, but *skolo* in turn adopts the optative form.) *varþar at vite svā* ('es ist wichtig zu wissen', Gering) Hdl. 17<sup>4</sup>; 18<sup>4</sup>; *vǫromk at vite*, Hdl. 33<sup>2</sup>; 36<sup>2</sup>; 40<sup>2</sup>; cf. 'Tis meet Achilles meet not Hector, *Troil. and Cress.*

The very same type occurs in the next, with the added complication that the main verb is in the potential optative. I do not consider them cases of *attraction*, as does Nygaard, I., p. 132. *vārea þat sōmt*, at *rēpe*, 'it would not be fit that he rule', Br. 9<sup>1</sup>; *þū vārer þess verþost kvenna at fyr augom þēr Atla hjōggem, sæer brōþr þinom blōpogt sār, . . . knēttar yfer binda*, Sg. 32<sup>4</sup>. Cf. 'Twere better she were kissed, *Troil. and Cress.*

In the last seven verbs the general type is that of the volitive. To classify more carefully, they bear the stamp of the *prescriptive optative* of Sanskrit, which type is easily recognized in the Greek optative and in the Latin subjunctive. The insertion of *skyler* in the second example reveals the tone of the mood. I am not sure that there are enough examples here to justify the recognition of the same sub-type in this Germanic dialect. Nygaard, II., p. 348, furnishes several good parallels from the prose.

The effect in the two following is viewed as intended: *vinna þess etke, at mēr vel þykke*, Am. 68<sup>5</sup>; *sums est sjalfskapa at hafe svā genget*, Am. 64<sup>4</sup>.

In the next two the substantive clause contains commands to the fancy of the listener: 'suppose you go to sleep, no man', etc. *ōkynnes þess vār þik enge maþr, at þū ganger snimma at sofa*, Hǫv. 19<sup>4</sup>; *hitt munde ðþra jōrlom þykkja at víþ menn mēltar ok mik sæer*, Gpr. III, 1<sup>4</sup>.

g) There are a few clauses with *at* that virtually form conditions. In these I recognize commands, half attached to the main clause by means of the *at*, but assuming an ellipsis. The tone is somewhat like that of 'I'll assure her of her widowhood, *be it that she survive me*', *Tam. of Shrew*. heipt *at* meire verþr *at* þann hjalm hafe, 'so much the greater will their wrath grow if they get the helm', *Fm.* 19<sup>4</sup>; sorger minke, *at* tregröf þat of talet *være*, *Ghv.* 22<sup>3</sup>; verþr hólþa hefnd léttrare . . . *at* sunr lifet, *Sg.* 12<sup>4</sup>; fegenn lēzk þō Hjalle *at* hann fjör þæge, *Am.* 59<sup>5</sup>; betr hefþer þū, bröþer *at* þū ī brynjo fōrer ('possible' condition), *Akv.* 17<sup>1</sup>.

There are some relative clauses that contain this optative of will and wish, but I prefer to treat the relatives together. See also under result clauses for a group of optatives that are closely related to the final clauses.

Finally, a remark about the preterite future, which is of such frequent occurrence in final clauses. *Skolo* has not become predominant in the Edda as it seems to be in later prose, and *mono* is not nearly so frequent. Eight times, in the dependent volitive examples, the simple preterite optative stands as a preterite future, while the preterite of *skolo* occurs seven times in that sense. For prose usage, refer to Nygaard, I, 320ff. Finally, I see no reason for recognizing a type of the optative in simple fact substantive clauses apart from those expressing will, wish, etc., although Delbrück is inclined to do so, pp. 239-41.

### 3. *The optative is used in concessions.*

The clause is sometimes introduced by a semi-dependent indefinite pronoun: huggez k it, *hvēges* þat *gørvesk*, *Am.* 32<sup>2</sup>, 'Be of good cheer whatsoever betide'. sykn emk . . . *hvē* hverr *vellē*, *Gpr.* III, 8<sup>4</sup>. Cf. 'Howe'er the world go I'll make sure for one', Marlowe. The regular introductory word is *þōt* (rarely *þō* . . . *at*.) with which the optative is invariably used in the Edda. The list of occurrences is easily found in Gering. I shall therefore give but a few examples and point out the notable peculiarities.

1. One expects of course to find a difference of mood between concessions of facts which are conceded purely and simply as facts and concessions made for the sake of an argument and the like. The other Germanic dialects keep this distinction. (Delbrück, *Beiträge*, p. 301; cf. also the use of *quamquam* and *quamvis* in the best Latin.) In the Edda I find no such distinction. There are over seventy instances of *þōt*, and it is

always followed by the optative. The present tense is found in a large majority of these. Here one finds expressed several shades of meaning from the concession of what is only imagined to the concession of what is apparently a fact. *rinnea sã marr es und þær rinne þõt fiandr þína forþask eiger*, H. H. II, 30<sup>4</sup>; 'If you ever ride may not your horse run tho you must outrun the enemy'. *Bũ es betra þõt lítet sē*, 'Be it ever so humble there's no place like home', Hgv. 36; *lope sviþnar þõt ek ā lopt berak*, Grm. 1<sup>3</sup>. 'The garment is being singed tho I hold it up to the air'.

Of course one may say that the speaker views the fact not as a matter of fact but with indifference. This can not be disproved in the case of the present tense. In the past tense, however, one finds that the real distinctions have broken down. A past act can hardly be viewed as though still in the field of the unreal or ideal. Compare the various degrees of 'reality' in the following examples: *þō mundak gefa þær . . . þõt vāre ōr golle*, Þrk. 4<sup>3</sup> (*vāre* is called for, since it is practically in a contrary-to-fact condition); *Alfr mon sigre ǫllom rāpa, þõt þetta sinn þorǥe vāre*, H. Hv. 39<sup>1</sup>. (Again *vāre* is expected since the verb is ideally conceived of); so also: *eige emk haptr þõt vārak hernume*, Fm. 8<sup>3</sup>. In such sentences the present is possible and is usually found. The preterite is probably due to the analogy of conditional sentences, which usually take the preterite in 'possible' conditions.

The extreme development is shown in instances like the following: *tōk at rāpa þõt hann reiþr vāre*, Am. 50<sup>1</sup>, 'he spoke tho he was angry' (cf. Am. 86<sup>1</sup>). A half-way step to such extreme cases can be found in generalizing clauses in the preterite like the following: *sagði ekki fleira þōtt hann vāri at spurþr*, Grm. 28, 'He spoke no more even when asked'.

It is clear that something more than 'point of view' is necessary to explain this uniformity of mood with *þõt* in so great a diversity of circumstances, and Delbrück's statement of the case evidently does not go far enough. The mood of the volitive has evidently been carried by analogy from the present of the second and third persons into the first person. It has covered the whole field of the present regardless of whether facts or fancies were the subjects of the concessions. Thence it has gone into the whole field of the preterite, entering first through generalizing sentences, 'possible' and 'unreal'

conditions. In later prose, Nygaard gives some instances of the indicative, and in modern Scandinavian as in English the indicative has more than recaptured its rightful possessions in the field of concessive clauses.

I add a few peculiar examples that seem to fall into the class of the concessive sentence. *skör es skopapr illa eða skapt sē rangt, þā er þēr bōls beþet*, Hōv. 125<sup>6</sup>, '(suppose) the shoes are badly made or be the spear ill-shaped, men will curse you'. The tacit concession of the first clause is made explicit by the optative in the second. *þat ræpk þēr . . . at þū truer aldre vqrom vargdropa hverstu est brōþorbane eða hafer þū feldan fqþor*, 'whose brother you have slain—or suppose you have slain the father'. Sd. 35<sup>4</sup>.

In a similar anacoluthon, a concessive optative is attached to an indicative condition with a coördinate conjunction, and even to an adjective. *Segðu þat . . . ef þitt øpe dugur ok þū viler*, Vm. 20<sup>2</sup>; 22<sup>2</sup>; *alz þik svinnan kveða ok þū viler*, Vm. 24<sup>2</sup>; 26<sup>2</sup>; 28<sup>2</sup>; 30<sup>2</sup>; 32<sup>2</sup>; 34<sup>2</sup>; 36<sup>2</sup>; 40<sup>2</sup>; *ef hann fregenn esat ok nae hann purrfjallr þruma*, Hōv. 30<sup>4</sup> *ef þū reyna knætt ok stigak*, H. Hv. 21<sup>1</sup>; cf. 'An't *please* the gods, I'll hide my master'. *sem ake jō øbryddom, ok sē tamr illa*, 'as if one drove an unbroken horse—yes, be he wild at that', Hōv. 89<sup>2</sup>.

The following condition with *nær* is of course a concession. *esa mēr ørvænt nær øro komer upp und skipe*, 'suppose you come up; it would not be surprising', H. Hv. 23<sup>2</sup>.

### III. THE POTENTIAL OPTATIVE.

#### 1. *In connection with a conditional protasis.*

The potential optative in independent sentences has a very limited usage and seems to be derivative in origin. I shall therefore give precedence to the commoner and more important usages found in the apodoses of conditional sentences. In this section we are concerned with the apodosis only. The conditional period as such will be discussed later.

1) The *present tense* of the potential optative does not occur in apodoses of conditions in Old-Icelandic. Since Gothic is the only dialect to show it in good usage, it must have disappeared some time before the creation of the poems we are discussing.

The preterite tense is found not only in 'unreal', but also at times in so-called 'possible' conditions.

2) This latter usage is particularly suited to instances where acts and states apparently non-existing are for the moment pictured as possible. A verb denoting mental action is common. The instances in the Edda are: horskr þōtte mēr ef hafa kynne āstrāþ, 'wise should I deem him if he were but able (= should be able?) to take your advice', Fm. 35<sup>1</sup>; þā vāre hefnr þēr Helga dauþa ef vārer vargr, 'his death would be avenged if you were a wolf (if you should become a wolf?) out in the wilds', H. H. II. 32<sup>2</sup>; sǣll ek þā þōttomk ef ek sea knǣttak, Hm. 21; spakr þōtte mēr spiller bauga ef æte, Fm. 32<sup>3</sup>; ef vēr fimm suno fþom (note indicative) lenge ǫtt of gōþa knǣttem, Sg. 18<sup>6</sup>. Note Delbrück's comment: Ich denke dass in solchen fällen der irreale ausdruck aus vorsicht gewählt ist, p. 263. It is hard to understand why there should be any 'vorsicht', when no other construction was possible for this type of sentence.

3) The preterite optative is used in both clauses of an 'unreal' condition for the present as well as for the past timesphere. Sometimes the 'pluperfect' is used for the latter. ef ek inne ættak Baldre glikan bur, út þū nē kvæmer, 'If I had a son like Balder you would not escape thus', Ls. 27<sup>3</sup>; af vāre nū haufþ, ef Erpr lifþe, 'your head would be off now, if E. were alive', Hm. 28<sup>1</sup>: vārak enn komenn, ef ek nē nytak, 'I should have come in, had she not helped me', Hǫv. 107<sup>3</sup>; lenge liggja læter þū þann enn aldra jǫton ef þū sverþs nē nyter, 'you would have let the old giant rest longer had you not used my sword', Fm. 27<sup>1</sup>; ef vārak . . . bārak, Ls. 14<sup>3</sup>; ef ættak . . . mǫlpak, Ls. 43<sup>3</sup>; nē mǫle . . . ef vissem, Grt. 10<sup>3</sup>; komenn vāre . . . ef hygþe, H. H. II. 49<sup>1</sup>; vāre . . . ef angrapet, Grp. 34<sup>3</sup>; ef nāþer . . . sǣe, Fm. 7<sup>1</sup>; ætte . . . ef knǣtte, Sg. 3<sup>4</sup>; vāre . . . ef gǣfe, Sg. 60<sup>1</sup>; rēþe-nema frýþer, Fm. 30<sup>3</sup>; betr. hefþer þū at þū fōrer, Akv. 17<sup>1</sup>; skyldak launa . . . ef kōmomk (Gering, 171), Hrbl. 29.

4) In certain idiomatic phrases, *munda* + *infinitive* was displacing the preterite optative in such apodoses, noticeably in affirmative periods; with the omission of *vesa* and *verþa* when a participle followed; and with certain verbs. In prose this becomes the more usual method of speech. Both time-spheres are thus served, as in the regular construction: *mundak* (segja) fleira ef meirr mjǫtoþr mǣlrūm gǣfe, 'I should speak more if fate gave me more time', Sg. 70; ǫjafnt skipta es þū *munder* . . . ef þū ætter, 'you would divide unfairly if you had the power',

Hrbl. 74; mikel *munde* ætt jǫtna ef aller lifþe, Hrbl. 67, 68; langt *munder* þū nū komenn ef þū lip of fǫrer, 'far would you have come', Hrbl. 127; *munde* rāpa ef helde, Br. 8<sup>3</sup>; *mynder* segja . . . ef mættir, Grp. 52<sup>3</sup>; *munde* boþet, ef þryftak, Hǫv. 67; gneggja *mynder* . . . ef nē vārer, H. Hv. 20<sup>1</sup>; *munda* . . . drepa ef ek mætta, Hrbl. 81; *munda* veita ef kvæmomk, Hrbl. 95; *munda* trúa nema vëlter, Hrbl. 96; *mundak* gefa þót vāre, Þrk. 4<sup>3</sup>; the forms of both moods fall together in the preterite singular of this verb so that undoubted instances of the indicative like the following are very instructive as well as strange: hennar *mundop* hefna leita ef mōþ ætteþ mīnna brōþra, 'You would seek vengeance if you had my brothers' courage, Ghv. 3<sup>3</sup>.

2. Derived from the above mentioned usages is the *independent potential* found particularly in the preterite, having passed through the intermediate stage of the period in which the condition is easily understood, or supplied in some abridged form: lētak þēr þat fyr lyge (the mood is kept up from the preceding 'ef vārak—bārak'), 'that I'd give for thy lies', Ls. 14<sup>4</sup>; þats betr ān vāre, 'It were better (if) left unsaid', (a condition is implied in *ān*) Am. 35<sup>4</sup>. Similar instances of the independent potential optative with an understood condition more or less remote are the following: þū vārer þess verþost, Sg. 32<sup>1</sup>; vāre sōmra fyrr, Grp. 5<sup>3</sup>; vāre, Sg. 35<sup>4</sup>; Am. 81<sup>1</sup>; vārak, Hrbl. 94; vārea, Br. 9<sup>1</sup>; lēter, Akv. 17<sup>4</sup>; semþe Hlr. 1<sup>3</sup>; dygge, Am. 48<sup>5</sup>; knāttem, Ghv. 5<sup>3</sup>; þyrfte (in a relative clause), Hǫv. 22<sup>3</sup>. *munda* + *infinitive* is frequent: *munde* vesa, Sg. 38<sup>4</sup>; Fm. 38<sup>3</sup>; H. H. II, 46<sup>4</sup>; *munde* reka, Gþr. III. 6<sup>3</sup>; *munde* þykkja, Gþv. III. 1<sup>3</sup>; hyggja *mundak*, Fm. 36<sup>2</sup>; *mundak* binda, Hm. 21<sup>3</sup>. There are two instances of the potential of *mega* in which of course the lexical and modal meanings are very similar: vel mættem tveir truask, 'well might we trust one another', Skm. 5<sup>4</sup>; heldr mætteþ er hestom rīpa, Rþ. 48<sup>1</sup>.

a) *skolo* originally expressed obligation, propriety, necessity and the like. The second and third persons of the verb, therefore, became convenient forms for the conveyance of commands and statements of obligation. Such expressions, however, need to be modified and softened in tone when addressed to persons not of humble station (cf. the behavior of *volo*, *velim faciat*, etc.). Thus it is that *skolo* appears in the present and preterite optative with more or less softened tone by the side of the indicative. This optative is to some extent of the same nature

as the potential optative in the apodosis of the conditional sentence, but with *skyle* of the 'modest statement' one does not necessarily supply a conditional protasis. The present tense is the most common, but when the context refers the act deprecated or recommended to the past time, *skolo* is put into the past. The reader will find that the present usually has a tone of mild command or prohibition, while the preterite almost always touches questions of moral obligation or propriety with a tone of deprecation. This distinction is of course merely an accident of logic, since one may command when an act is not yet complete, but when the act is once done, one can only pronounce judgment, favorable or otherwise, if one likes to pronounce judgments. Such considerations have much to do with the very interesting semasiology of such words as *skolo*, *vilja*, etc. meþalsnotr *skyle* manna hvern, æva til snotr *sē*, Hǫv. 54<sup>1</sup>; 55<sup>1</sup>; 56<sup>1</sup>, 'middling wise should every man be, never overwise', meyjar orþom *skyle* mange trúa, Hǫv. 83<sup>1</sup>, 'let no man trust the word of a maiden'; gættir allar . . . skopask *skyle*, umb skygnask *skyle*, Hǫv. 1<sup>2,3</sup>; at hyggjande sinne *skylet* maþr hrösendr vesa, Hǫv. 6<sup>1</sup>; hugalt *skyle* þjóþans barn . . . vesa, Hǫv. 15<sup>1</sup>; reifr *skyle* gumna hvern, Hǫv. 15<sup>3</sup>; árlega verþar *skyle* maþr opt fá, Hǫv. 33<sup>1</sup>; fear sins . . . *skylet* maþr þorþ þola, Hǫv. 39<sup>2</sup>; hlátr víþ hlátre *skyle* hólþar taka, Hǫv. 42<sup>3</sup>; övinar sins *skyle* enge maþr vinar vinr vesa, Hǫv. 43<sup>3</sup>; geymenn *skyle* gumna hvern (?), Hǫv. 65<sup>1</sup>; *skylet* þann vætkes vā Hǫv. 74<sup>4</sup>; ástar firna *skyle* enge maþr annan aldrege, Hǫv. 92<sup>1</sup>; orlogom ykrom *skyleþ* aldrege segja, Ls. 25<sup>1</sup>; slíks *skyle* synja aldre maþr fyr annan, Od. 22<sup>3</sup>; hön *skyle* morna, Od. 30<sup>2</sup>; þik *skyle* aller eiþar bíta, H. H. II. 29<sup>1</sup>; hēr *skyle* enge orþom granda, Grt. 6<sup>1</sup>; þitt *skyle* hjarta hrafnar slíta, Gþr. II. 9<sup>3</sup>; þriggja náttu *skylak* þar koma, H. Hv. 33<sup>4</sup>; útar hverfa þess þeir innar *skyle* (?), Fj. 16<sup>3</sup>; ríke sitt *skyle* rápsnotra hvern í höfe hafa, Hǫv. 64<sup>1</sup>.

*In the preterite* (most of these are in dependence upon verbs in the past tense). opt þū gaft þeim þū gefa nē *skylder*, Ls. 22<sup>3</sup>, 'you often gave victory to those to whom you should not have given it'; ef ek gaf þeim gefa nē *skyldak*, Ls. 23<sup>1</sup>; hrolde hotvetna þats til hags *skyldi*, Am. 91<sup>5</sup>; þā vėlte mik *es* vesa *skyldi* allra eiþa einn fulltrue, Br. 2<sup>3</sup>; Gunnare gatk at unna . . . sem Brynhildr *skyldi*, Od. 19<sup>2</sup>; hön mon þer unna sem ek *skyldak*, Sg. 57<sup>4</sup>; maga hefr þū þinna mist . . . sem þū sít *skylder*, Am. 77<sup>2</sup>; sem þū sít *skylder*, Am. 80<sup>3</sup>; svā *skyldi*

hverr þrom verja . . . at sēr nē stríddet, Hm. 8<sup>3</sup>; *skyle* usually occurs in such generalizing statements of propriety. However, in this instance the immediate reference of the verb to the act mentioned in the context has perhaps effected its tense. *nio rǫstom es þū skylder* neþarr vesa, H. Hv. 16<sup>3</sup>; *sǫtom vit Vǫlundr saman í holme, æva skyldi*, Vkv. 43<sup>3</sup>, 'It should never have happened'. Sijmons brackets the line. The syntax of it is certainly peculiar.

I add to this list two sentences, one containing the present optative of *mega* and one of *mono*, both in dependent clauses: *kann maþr mjǫt þess viþar es vinnask mege*, Hǫv. 60<sup>3</sup>; *mart es mjǫk gliklekt at munem skammæer*, Am. 26<sup>4</sup>.

b) *vilja* like *skolo* lends itself readily to the peculiar modal modifications of the optative (cf. *volo, velim, vellem*). The present tense is frequently used in a polite or subdued statement of the speaker's wish: *viljak þat lita*, Am. 54<sup>2</sup>; 'I would fain see it'. *eiga viljak heldr*. Alv. 7<sup>3</sup>; *ek vilja vita*, Fj. 7; 9; 11; 13; 15; 17; 19; 21; 23; 25; 27; 29; 31; 33; 35; 37; 39; 41; (in a relative clause) Skm. 3<sup>2</sup>: *ek viljak ykr hugfulla tvā und hvera setja*, Hym. 9<sup>1</sup>. In the following nine examples, R reads *vil ek: viljak* . . . *vita*, Skm. 39<sup>1</sup>; Vm. 3<sup>3</sup>; 6<sup>3</sup>; Alv. 8<sup>4</sup>; *viljak spyrja*, Hrbl. 24; *viljak eigi* . . . *ganga*, Gpr. II. 28<sup>1</sup>; *viljak* . . . *hafa*, Alv. 7<sup>1</sup>; *ānaup þola ek vilja aldrege*, Skm. 24; Hrist ok Mist *viljak at mēr horn bere*, Grm. 36<sup>1</sup>. The next two are found in dependent general clauses: *nū skolo ganga þærs goll vile*, Sg. 48<sup>1</sup>; *mane monk þik hugga, . . . silfre snæhvīto, sem þū sjǫlf viler*, Am. 66<sup>4</sup>. I find two verbs in the preterite: *vildak eige vēlom beita jǫfra brúpe*, Grp. 40<sup>3</sup>; *fyrir vildak at Frekasteine hrafna seþja* . . . H. H. I. 46<sup>1</sup>; 'I would sooner sate the ravens on your corpse'. If the next is in the optative, it belongs to the same list: *lægak sīpan,—nē sofa vildak*,—Gpr. II 45<sup>1</sup>.

It is noticeable that Old-Icelandic is almost destitute of an independent potential optative in the *present*. It may be that the examples of *skyle* just listed are not to be considered in the same class as those of *vilja*, but rather as future volitives; in other words, when 'hann skal hafa' became an equivalent of 'hæfe hann', the *skal* was levelled into the form of the latter: 'hann *skyle* hafa'. A reading of Hǫvamǫl is helpful in this matter.

Of *vilja* there are examples in the first person singular only, and even these are frequently exchanged for *vil*. Delbrück (p. 204) compares Gothic *wiljan*.



This disappearance of a potential optative in the independent sentences of the present may help to account for the lack of present optative *apodoses* in conditional sentences and, for the matter of that, in either part of a regular conditional period; while *nema* regularly takes a present as does *ef* at times in 'mixed' conditions.

In the *preterite*, I find the potential optative in independent sentences more widely extended, e. g. in *vildak*, *skylda-er-e*; *mættem*; *mætteþ*; *munda-er-e*; *væra-er-e*; *knættem*; *læta-er*; also in a few semidependent relative clauses. They refer to the present as well as to the past timesphere. In fact, they bear every mark of having grown out of potential apodoses of conditions, and must not be treated as free-born and independent citizens of the world of sentences.

#### IV. USAGES OF THE OPTATIVE DERIVED FROM ONE OR COMPOSED OF MORE THAN ONE OF THE PRECEDING CONSTRUCTIONS.

##### 1. *Conditions with ef.*

Delbrück arrives at the following conclusion: Im germanischen dient für die drei angegebenen fälle (*tatsächlichkeit, möglichkeit, irrealität*) der *indicativ*, der *optativ des praesens*, der *optativ des praeteritums* (p. 257). In Old-Icelandic the usage is as follows:

1) The indicative is used in 'fact' conditions. There are more than a hundred examples of the normal type, as: *sorg etr hjarta ef þū segja nē naer*: Hǫv. 120, 'Sorrow eats the heart if you cannot confide your thoughts to another'. *qlrūnar skaltu kunna ef þū vill . . .*, Sd. 7<sup>1</sup>. The if-clause usually follows as in the examples given. Of course there are all the mixed-conditions one finds in every language. These can be omitted here, as Gering's list is complete and excellently arranged.

2) The Edda can hardly be said to betray a clear type in the use of the present optative in 'possible' conditions. There are but two such conditions and both are of the same kind. They follow an imperative and are uttered in an ironical tone: *nālgask þū mik ef þū meger*, 'Now come if you can'! Grm. 53<sup>4</sup>; *vega þū gakk ef þū vreipr seer*, 'If you really are so angry', Ls. 15<sup>3</sup>.

If one may draw conclusions from this meagre evidence, it seems that in affirmative conditions the present optative has become highly specialized to be used only in the peculiar phrase and tone found in those two examples. In the negative condition

("exception") with *nema* the present optative is so freely used (28 examples) that its absence with the affirmative seems remarkable. The Edda does not stand alone in this respect, for the later prose shows the same habit, Nygaard, I. p. 138-40. The lost ground seems partly to have been captured by the preterite optative, which regularly appears in unreal conditions, but also occurs at times in conditions obviously in the region of possibility. Cf. <sup>1</sup> *horskr þōtte mēr, ef hafa kynne ástrāþ miket yþvar systra*, 'If he would take your kind counsel I should deem him wise', Fm. 35; cf. Hm. 21<sup>1</sup>; H. H. II. 32<sup>2</sup>; Fm. 32<sup>3</sup>; and the examples under conclusions in the potential optative.

3) The preterite optative is regularly used in both clauses of 'unreal' conditions (see the list under conclusions in pot. opt.).

a) 'present contrariety to fact': *sōmre vāre syster ykkor . . . ef henne gāfe gōþra rāþa*, 'Your sister would fare better if you gave her good advice', Sg. 60<sup>3</sup>.

b) 'past contrariety to fact': *lenge liggja lēter þū þann enn aldna jōton ef þū sverþs nē nyter*, 'You would have let the old giant rest longer had you not used my sword', Fm. 27<sup>1</sup>. See also the above cited examples of the preterite used in conditions that are not strictly 'unreal'.

The preterite optative is sometimes called for to express a future or possible condition shifted into the past by means of a preterite main verb. *hēt þa ferþ Gunnarr, ef Høgne vilde*, Am. 7<sup>3</sup>, a subsequent narration of Gunnar's words: 'I will go if Høgne will'. Cf. Sf. 15; Am. 7<sup>1</sup>.

## 2. Conditions with *nema* (= *nisi*).

Cf. 'No man can do these miracles that thou doest *except* God *be* with him', John, 3, 2.

1) The indicative does not occur. (The indicative example given by Delbrück p. 265, does not apply). Some of the examples with the present optative are similar to some negative conditions with the indicative. However the *nema*-clause probably was not felt as an ordinary negative condition; it is not far from concessive and other clauses of a volitive shading.

2) The *present optative* is regularly used. A negative is usually found in the main clause and the main clause usually precedes the *nema*-clause. *enge þat veit at hann etke kann nema*

<sup>1</sup> Nygaard I, p. 141, interprets these as conditions 'som udsiges som et tilfælde, den talende alene tænker sig eller antager', to which Delbrück evidently agrees: 'etwas rein gedachtes', p. 262.

hann *mæle* til mart, 'No one knows that he is a fool unless he talks too much', Hǫv. 27<sup>4</sup>; *ūt þū nē kōmr nema þū enn snotrare sēr*, 'You will not go out unless you prove to be the cleverer' Vm 7<sup>4</sup>. There are 28 examples of this regular type. See Gering, sub. voc. cit.

3) Probably the preterite optative did not form a recognized type. There are seven examples, but all of them seem to be effected by some kind of 'tempusverschiebung'. Kvaðat mann ramman . . . nema kalk *bryte*, Hym. 29<sup>4</sup>, as well as Ls. 9<sup>4</sup>; Sg. 37<sup>3</sup>; and Od. 15<sup>4</sup>, contain preterite futures in oratio obliqua expressed or implied; while Hrbl. 96, H. H. II. 32<sup>4</sup>, represent the condition as purely imaginary. Fm. 30<sup>4</sup> seems to be the only instance of an 'unreal' condition with *nema*: *rēpe sã enn frãne ormr nema þū frýper mēr hvats hugar*.

3. *The comparative clause with 'sem'*. It is usual to treat the *sem*-clauses with the conditional periods, although the volitive can present better claims upon it. I have followed tradition here.

1) *svã . . . sem*. a) *present tense*. Cf. 'The air breathes upon us here . . . as't were perfumed by a fen'. Tempest. *svã skalt láta sem life* báper, 'you shall be as happy as if both were alive', Gpr. II. 29<sup>3</sup>; *svã's fripr kvenna . . . sem ake jō óbryddom . . . eþa í byr öpom beite . . . eþa skyle haltr henda hrein*, Hǫv. 89; b) *preterite*. *sã hann ljös mikit svã sem eldr brynni*, Sd. 2; *svã vas Sigvörpr . . . sem være geirlaukr, ör grase vaxenn*. Gpr. I. 17<sup>2</sup>; Gpr. II. 2<sup>2</sup>; *svã vas Svanhildr, sem være sãmleitr sölár geisle*, Ghv. 15<sup>4</sup>; *svã hafþe Helge hrædda görva fiandr sīna . . . sem fyr ulfe rynnne geitr*, H. H. II. 36<sup>3</sup>; *svã vas at heyra, es saman kvömo . . . , sem björg víþ brim brotna munde*, H. H. I. 29<sup>3</sup>; *svã vas á vísat sem under være bane*, Am. 12<sup>2</sup>; *víkr hēr svã til sem þeir dræpi hann úti*, Br. 20. pr. 2.

2) *sem*. a) *present tense*. *sitr ok snöper, lætr sem solgenn sē* Hǫv. 33<sup>3</sup>, 'He will sit and snuffle as if he were starving'; *þū mont hvíla . . . hjã meyjo sem möper sē*, Grp. 43<sup>2</sup>; *þeyge es sem þū þrjú bũ göþ eiger*, Hrbl. 10; *hleypr úte . . . sem meþ höfom Heiþrūn fare*, Hdl. 47<sup>4</sup>; 48<sup>4</sup>. b) *preterite*. *brynjan var föst sem hon væri holdgröin*, Sd. 7; 'The brynja was immovable as if it had grown to the soil'; *fylgþak . . . sem vit bröþrom værem*, Od. 10<sup>4</sup>; *var sem hann rípi í myrkva*, F. H. 2<sup>5</sup>; *svöfom . . . sem bröper minn . . . være* Hlr. 12<sup>2</sup>; *hrait . . . sem björn hryte*, Hm. 26<sup>2</sup>; *læzt þer alt pykkja sem etke være*, Am. 90<sup>1</sup>; (munek) *hyggja á þörf hverja sem vit holl værem* Am. 97<sup>4</sup>; *vöro . . . sem loge före*, Hdl. 24<sup>4</sup>.

The following seems to contain a simple comparison with an existing object. *Sem* here means *as*, not *as if*: *nū'mk svā litel sem lauf see opt i jolstrom*, Gþr. I, 18<sup>3</sup>. In all other sentences of this kind the indicative is used, except in a very few, where the so-called potential force prevails: *Am. 66<sup>4</sup>; viler, skylder, Am. 77<sup>2</sup>; dygþe, Am. 48<sup>5</sup>; myndak, H. H. II. 46<sup>4</sup>; Fm. 36<sup>2</sup>.*

This type exists in all the German dialects. Cf. Goth., *swe*; Ags. *swā*; O. H. G., *sama sō*; O. Sw., *sum*, etc. Cf. also Gk. *ὥς εἰ*; Lat. *quasi*. The tone approaches very closely to that of the 'unreal' condition, which fact will account for its eagerness to consort with the preterite optative in spite of the fact that it must have come into existence with the present optative in a kind of command to the imagination. However, so far does it honor its former associations as to make frequent use of the present, while, as has been pointed out, the regular conditions have almost entirely deserted that tense by the time of the Eddas. There are 9 examples in the present, 15 in the preterite, most of which follow a main verb in the preterite.

#### 4. Comparative clauses after *an*, *en*.

Cf. O. E. That was him *levere than* hys fader *were*. Rich. of Gl. Delbrück gives the following rule for Germanic, Beiträge, p. 291: Im *vergleichungssatze* steht der *optativ*. Das ist der fall, wenn der inhalt des satzes nicht der sphäre der *tatsächlichkeit*, sondern der der *vorstellung* zugewiesen wird. Der *hauptsatz* ist dabei in der grossen mehrzahl der fälle *positiv*. The examples are peculiar in the Edda, so that any general rule is liable to be misleading. The facts are as follows:

1) The indicative examples are rare, but occur after the affirmative as well as after the negative.

2) Negated principal clauses are rare.

3) The present tense is invariably found, and in the field of the present, sentences can usually be adjudged to the sphere of *tatsächlichkeit* or *vorstellung* at the whim of the judge. The examples are as follows (I omit *fyr an* for the present): *askr Yggdrasels drýger erþe meira an menn vite*, 'It suffers more than men wot of', Grm. 35<sup>2</sup>; *betra es öbeþet an sē ofblötet*, Hǫv. 145<sup>1</sup>, 'better is no praying than (is) too much offering'; *alt es betra an sē brighom at vesa*, 'anything is better than (is) fickleness', Hǫv. 123<sup>3</sup>; *sōtt monoþ it Guþrān snemr an hygger*, Sg. 53<sup>1</sup>, 'G. may be appeased sooner than you expect'. There are twenty-two instances (five of which are somewhat doubtful)

like these of the *optative* after a main clause in the *affirmative*. They are as follows: *betre-an-sē*, Hōv. 70<sup>1</sup>; 71<sup>3</sup>; 123<sup>3</sup>; 145<sup>1</sup>; 145<sup>3</sup>; Akv. 7<sup>6</sup>; Fm. 28<sup>1</sup>; 29<sup>1</sup>; 30<sup>1</sup>; Sd. 26<sup>3</sup>; 31<sup>3</sup>; Skm. 13<sup>1</sup>; H. H. I. 47<sup>3</sup>; *verre . . . an-vite*; Sd. 24<sup>4</sup>; *verre . . . an-siler* (ind.?), Hym. 20<sup>2</sup>; *þpra an hafey* (ind.?), Rþ. 49<sup>2</sup>; *meira an . . . vite*, Grm. 35<sup>2</sup>; *fleira an hygge*, Grm. 34<sup>2</sup>; *gørr an spyrjak*, Grp. 8<sup>1</sup>; *snemr an hygger* (ind.?) Sg. 53<sup>1</sup>; *an viter* (corrupt text), Gþr. II, 9<sup>4</sup>; *heldr an . . . skīne*, Akv. 29<sup>4</sup>; *verr an varer* (ind.?), Hōv. 39<sup>4</sup>. In all of the above the interpretation of Delbrück is possible, though in many cases the speaker is obviously dealing with matters of fact, be the momentary point of view what it may. Cf. Grp. 8<sup>1</sup>; Grm. 34<sup>2</sup>; Sg. 53<sup>1</sup>. *Skīne* of Akv. 29<sup>4</sup>, is apparently a volitive.

After a negative Delbrück quotes but two optative examples from the Edda, and decides that there are not enough for the recognition of the type (p. 293). Perhaps *five* cases deserve better treatment, especially as only three indicatives occur after negatives, and they seem to be sufficient for his purpose. The optatives after negatives are: *vegnest verra vegra hann . . . an sē ofdrykkja ǫls*, 'There is no worse burden for the wayfarer than (is) a load of ale', Hōv. 11<sup>4</sup>; *monat mætre maþr ā mold koma . . . an Sigorþr þykke*, Grp. 53<sup>4</sup>; *byrþe betre berrat maþr an sē manvit*, Hōv. 10<sup>2</sup>; 11<sup>2</sup>; *sofey eige lengr . . . an svā ljōþ eitt kvepak*, Grt. 7<sup>4</sup>.

The indicative is not often found, but does occur after the affirmative as well as after the negative, especially in the preterite, where one obviously deals largely with matters of fact.

The indicative after a negative main clause: *gaf hann þeim eigi lengri hvíld en meþan gaukrinn þagþi*, Grt. 23 (note the tense). *Helgi mætti eigi forþaz annan veg en tók klæþi ambóttar*, H. H. II, 1, pr. 2 (note the tense). *øng es sōtt verre . . . an sēr øngo at una*, Hōv. 94<sup>4</sup>. The indicative after an affirmative main clause: *apra felde . . . an hafa vilde*, Fm. 43<sup>4</sup> (note the tense). So far as the form is concerned *vilde* may of course be an optative, 'She felled others than Odin wished to have'. *faer sea nū fram of lengra an Ōpenn mon ulfe mōta* (pregnant, = *than till*), Hdl. 45<sup>4</sup>.

Delbrück's rule, therefore, holds good for the Edda with the following reservations:

1st) The optative does not seem to have any particular aversion to a negative main clause. Delbrück shows that it ought to

(p. 300) and that it does in general in Germanic. Probably fixed phrases like *betre an sē*, which in fact makes up a majority of the optatives in both cases, obliterated such distinctions. Such stereotyped phrases often show as little regard for logical as for historical obligations.

2nd) The instances of the indicative are too few and too dissimilar to support any theory, to form a type, or to authorize any statement except one to the effect that the indicative occurs (and that for obvious reasons) in the examples of the preterite.

5. *Comparative temporal clauses with āpr and fyrran.*

1) Cf. 'This night *before* the cock *crow*, thou shalt deny me thrice'. Math. 26, 34. I shall treat *āpr* first. Delbrück's rule is as follows: (Der optativ) wird angewendet wenn der sprechende den eintritt der satzhandlung als möglich, wahrscheinlich, aller voraussicht nach bevorstehend bezeichnet oder dem subject dieselbe stimmung zuschreibt. (Beiträge, p. 295.)

This rule holds in part, but it must not be pressed into service in every case. Just as in Latin a similar rule applied to Cicero's clauses but broke down later, so that the subjunctive appeared in narration of actual events, so here the line of demarcation has been partly obliterated. In his translations of examples Delbrück seems too eager for consistent support of his rule. *grætr* is of course *present* in H. H. II. 44 (*grætr grimmom tōrom āpr sofa ganger*). His translation is: "du *wirst* (täglich) bittere tränen weinen ehe du schlafen gehst". I fail to find that meaning in the passage. Helgi's ghost is explaining to Sigrun why the corpse is so cold and damp. He says it is because: 'you weep cruel tears before you go to sleep—these tears fall upon my corpse'. Delbrück's rule hardly applies if this is the meaning. Again, at *Sifjar verr āpr sofa genge yxn tvā*, Hym. 15, is explained thus: "In erster person würde es heissen: 'ich esse ehe ich in aussicht nehme schlafen zu gehen', übertragen in die dritte 'ehe er schlafen gienge'". This implies a shifting that does not seem to lie in the natural interpretation of the sentence, *āpr* is purely narrative in this passage. This is a straightforward narration of some of Thor's remarkable feats: 'He ate two oxen before he went to bed'. I add some others that are most easily read as purely narrative. *þetta var āpr Atli færi*, H. Hv. 4, pr. 1; *āpr hann drykki*, kvaddi hann *āsuna*, Ls. 10, pr. 1; *āpr vāre jorþ of skopof þā vas B. borinn*, Vm. 29. Before giving the examples I would call attention to a few observations.

1. The *āþr* and *fyrr an* construction is obviously to be explained in connection with the other comparative clauses as Delbrück does. I would only add the suggestion that perhaps the *āþr* and *fyrr an* clauses contain a survival of a future (prospective) subjunctive in Germanic and that the other comparative clauses take the same mood by analogy.

2. The nature of the main clause is as important here as under the comparative clauses. There are 22 optatives after an affirmative, and only 3 after a negative. (See the lists. Delbrück gives none after negatives). There are 5 indicatives after an affirmative, but 12 after a negative. (This omits doubtful cases.) Delbrück explains very clearly the bearing of the negative upon such clauses, p. 300.

3. The tense is also of importance. Most of the indicatives are in past narration, though many of the optatives are also in the preterite. I classify according to the nature of the main clause and by tense. The indicatives may be found in Gering.

1) With the leading verb in the affirmative, a present tense. *gættar allar, āþr gange fram, umb skopask skyle, Hōv. 1<sup>1</sup>*, 'One should look at all exits before one walks forward'. *örinde mīn viljak öll vita āþr ek rīða hepan, Skm. 39<sup>2</sup>*; 'I want to know my answer before I ride away'; (*pū skalt*) *gefa svīnom soþ āþr sofa ganger, H. H. II. 38<sup>4</sup>*; *laug skal gōrva þeims lipner 'o . . . āþr ī kisto fare, Sd. 34<sup>3</sup>*; *skaltu . . . bera . . . at selja āþr hōn sōm telesk vāpn . . . at lea, Fj. 30<sup>3</sup>*; *segbu mēr þat āþr pū verþer soþle af mar ok pū stiger fete framarr* (probably), *Skm. 41. skalk fyr vestan . . . āþr Salgofner sigrþjōþ veke, H. H. II. 48<sup>4</sup>*; *grætr . . . āþr sofa ganger, ib. 44<sup>4</sup>*; *eina dōttor berr Alfrōpoll āþr henne Fenrer fare, Vm. 47<sup>2</sup>*. I add one instance of <sup>1</sup>*fyrr an*. *fyrir vilk kyssa konung an . . . kaster H. H. II. 43*.

*Preterite tense.* *at tvā Sifjar verr āþr sofa genge, Hym. 15<sup>3</sup>*, 'He ate two before he went to sleep'; *āþr hann drykki kvaddi hann, Ls. 10, pr. 1*; *āþr vāre jorþ of skopōþ þā vas B. borenn, Vm. 29; 35*; *hvat mælte Öþenn āþr ā bāl (Baldr) stige? Vm. 54<sup>3</sup>*; *þetta var āþr Atli færi, H. Hv. 4, pr. 1*; *lenge huger deildosk āþr of frægak, Gpr. II, 6<sup>2</sup>*; *sjaug hundroþ manna ī sal gengo āþr kvæn . . . tōke, Gpr. III, 7*; *māl et efsta . . . āþr hann sylte, Od. 14<sup>2</sup>*; *hōn hefr þriggja . . . borett . . . āþr sylte, Akv. 46<sup>4</sup>*; *soosk til sīþan āþr ī sundr hyrfe, Am. 33<sup>1</sup>*; *gōddak golle . . . āþr hana*

<sup>1</sup> The rest are indicatives: *Fm. 44, pr. 7*, and *F. H. 1<sup>3</sup>*, after negatives; and *H. H. II. 14<sup>3</sup>*, after an affirmative; all these are in the preterite.

*gāfak*, Ghv. 16<sup>2</sup>; *āpr* *saper yrpe*, *hristo teina*, Hym. 1<sup>2</sup>; *sumer . . . deildo . . . āpr þeir mǣtte . . . leggja*, Br. 4<sup>3</sup>; *þik kvazk . . . hitta vilja āpr . . . ōndo tynde* (probable), H. Hv. 37<sup>4</sup>; *āpr lētti kvæpinu, mōlu þaer*, Grt. 25.

2) With the leading verb in the negative (present tense): *mona hōndom hvilþ vel gefa āpr fullmalet Frōpa þykke*, Grt. 17<sup>4</sup>; (preterite): *vasa kyrrseta āpr Knue felle*, Grt. 14<sup>4</sup>; *gørþot far festa āpr þeir frā hyrfe*, Am. 34<sup>4</sup>; (probably indicative) *hēt hvāregre hvilþ nē ynþe, āpr hann heyrþe hljōm ambatta*, Grt. 2<sup>4</sup>. Note that these are all from late poems. *unz* once takes the optative in the sense of *āpr*: (*vilk*) *vita ef meine morþfōr kono unz af mēle enn mein kome* 'if they may prevent her death before some hindrance comes, Sg. 43<sup>5</sup>.

6. *Indirect Discourse.* 1) *After segja at, er sagt at, sogn at.*

The optative with this expression usually throws a shadow of uncertainty over the reality of the reported statement. Thus it betrays the fact that a report is false: *hōn sagþi Atla at hōn hefþi sēt Þjōprek ok Guþrūnu bæþi saman* Gþr. III, 2. (The scandal was soon disproved); so also *svāfep* and *verþesk*, Gþr. III, 2<sup>4</sup>. In Am. 78<sup>2</sup>, the speaker confesses by means of the optative that she had told a falsehood: *sagþak at kalfs vāre*, '(falsely) said it was calf's flesh'. Cf. *segja at eige vel eiþom þrymþer*, 'she will (falsely) say that', Grp. 47<sup>1</sup>. Sometimes statements poorly vouched for are put in the optative in contrast to generally conceded statements which are put in the indicative: *sumir segja svā at þeir draepi hann inni . . . en þýþverskir menn segja svā at þeir draepi hann ūti . . . ok svā segir i Guþrūnarkviðu . . . at . . . syner hefþi riþit . . . en þat segja allir einnig at þeir sviku hann*. Br. 20, epilog. 'some say that they slew him (opt.) . . . and others say that (opt.) etc., . . . but all are agreed in saying that (indic.)'. In the following, some marvel is reported in which the speaker reveals his disbelief by using the optative mood: *Helgi ok Svāva er sagt at vāri endrborin*, H. Hv. 43, (repeated after *kallat* at H. H. II, 50, pr. 3.); *þat er sogn manna at Guþrūn hefþi etit af Fāfnis hjarta*, Br., end. Vkv. 22<sup>4</sup> contains a command to tell a falsehood: *segeþa meyjom at it mik fyndeþ*, H. Hv. 34<sup>1</sup> reports what was once believed but is no longer: *Sagþer at Heþenn vāre gōþs verþr*, 'you said so then, (but not now)'. In Grm. 33, a small boy hesitatingly accuses his father the king: *Agnarr . . . sagþi at konungr gørþi illa at hann lēt þīna hann*. Hrbl. 9 practically quotes an optative after *hyggja*: *þat seger þū*



nū . . . at mīn mōþer dauþ *sē*. The reason for the mood of the next two is not so evident: þat er sagt at þā *kvæpi* þeir ljōþ, Grt. 24; seg þat i aptan . . . at *sē* Ylfingar austan komner, H. H. I. 35. One fragment is too short to justify a decision: Hār segir at hann *komi* eigi heill üt, F. M. I.

The indicative with *segja* reports facts and statements that purport to be true, or the accuracy of which the speaker does not at the time care to question. The examples—there are about as many as under the optative—are given in Gering, 893. They need not be repeated here. Cf. also Delbrück's clear discussion, p. 231.

māla takes the optative in three cases. It happens that in all three, the preterite of *skolo* or *mono* is used as preterite future in reporting former promises. (For Sf. 22, see under the volitive.) vit mæltom . . . at (þū) *mynder* mīn mōþogr vitja halr ör heljo, Ghv. 20<sup>2</sup>; mælt hafþak þat: *myndega* . . . ökunnan arme verja, H. Hv. 42<sup>2</sup>; es hinig mæltak, at hvivetna hjalpa *skyldak*, 'what I promised: that I would help', Od. 9<sup>4</sup>.

2) In general, the distinction pointed out with reference to the mood following *segja* holds true after all verbs sentiendi et declarandi. Thus *hyggja* (=to think) is never followed by the indicative, while *vita* (=to know) is almost always so. *hyggja*, with present tense in both clauses: dauþ hykk at þin mōþer *sē*, Hrbl. 8, cf. 9, 'I think that your mother is dead'; hykk at þu ljüger, Hrbl. 125, 'I think thou liest'; hykk at *eigem*, H. H. I. 18<sup>3</sup>; hykk at þitt *see*, H. Hv. 20<sup>3</sup>; hykk at *hæfe*, Hōv. 109<sup>1</sup>; hykk at *æ skyle*, Grm. 34<sup>5</sup>; hykk at *sē*, Grm. 54<sup>1</sup>; hykk at ek verþa *muna*, Gg. 5<sup>3</sup>; hykk at hōn *vite*, Ls. 21<sup>3</sup>; 29<sup>3</sup>; hykk at *myne*, Ls. 31<sup>1</sup>; hykk at *sē*, Fm. 13<sup>1</sup>; hykk at *myne*, Fm. 22<sup>3</sup>; hykk at *sē*, Fj. 44<sup>4</sup>; hykk at illa *gete*, Vm. 10<sup>3</sup>; hykk at feig *seer*, Sg. 31<sup>5</sup>; hykk ek at þū *þpa myner*, Hrbl. 120 R.

The three following are in the preterite, although in dependance upon the present tense of *hyggja*: hykk at hōn vörnōþ *býpe*, Akv. 8<sup>2</sup>, 'I think she gave us warning thereby'; hykk at *hēte* Hlēdis gyþja, Hdl. 13<sup>2</sup>; hykk at *hēte* Hreimr ok Fjösner, Rp. 12<sup>2</sup>.

In three examples both verbs are in the preterite: hann hugþi at fullsteikt *væri* hjartat, Fm. 31, pr. 2, 'he deemed the heart (of Fafnir) thoroughly roasted'; hugþak . . . at (örn) *være* hamr Atla, Am. 18<sup>4</sup>; hugþe hann at hefþe (hring) Hlōþvēs dōtter . . . *være* hōn aptr komenn, Vkv. 12.

The preterite future, when expressed by the optative, employs *mynda*. There is only one example: *hitt ek hugða at ek hafa mynda gef hennar alt ok gaman*, Hðv. 98.<sup>3</sup>

With *hyggja* the accusative + infinitive construction divides honors with the optative. The examples may be found in Gering.

A peculiar combination of both constructions is found chiefly in *Atlamöl* in the narration of dreams. *hyggja* introduces the narration with acc. + inf., or prt. ppl., while the details are added in the optative, usually without connecting particle. The occurrences are as follows: *blæjo hugðak þína brinna í elde*, *hryte hōr loge hūs mīn í gøgnom*, Am. 15, 'I thought the covering was burning (acc.+inf.), high flames broke through (prt. opt.) my house'; *björn hugðak inn komenn*, *bryte upp stokka*, *hriste svā hramma at vēr hrædd yrþem*; *munne oss mōrg hefþe svāt mættem etke*, Am. 16; *ōrn hugðak inn fljūga . . . dreifþe oss ōll blōþe*, Am. 18; *gōrvan hugðak þer galga*, *genger at hanga*, *æte þik ormar*, *yrþak þik kvikvan*; *gørþesk røk ragna*, Am. 21; *ō hugðak inn rinna at endlōngo hūse*, *þyte af þjōste*, *þeystesk of bekke*, *bryte fōtr ykra brōþra hēr tveggja*, *gørþet vatn vēgja*, Am. 24; *konor hugðak dauþar koma í nōtt hingat*, *være vart būnar*, *vilde þik kjōsa*, *þye þer brāþlega*, Am. 25. Most of the dream of Gpr. II, is related by means of the acc.+inf. construction, but the optative occurs once. *Hugðak mer af hende hvelpa losna . . . gylle bāþer*, Gpr. II, 43<sup>2</sup>; so also Brynhildr's dream: *Hugðomk*, *Gunnarr*, *grimt í svefne: svalt alt í sal*, *ættak sæing kalda*, *en þū*, *gramr*, *rīþer glaums andvane*, Br. 16<sup>3</sup>.

3) *vita* usually takes the indicative (9 times), even in circumstances under which *segja* might have an optative, e. g. after a negative. However the certainty implied in the word associates it easily with the mood of fact. The examples of the optative are: *hvat visser þū at vēr seem* (quoting another's words in a tone of incredulity), H. H. II. 10<sup>1</sup>, and an instance of the preterite future with *munde*, H. Hv. 35<sup>3</sup>. (Ls. 14<sup>1</sup>, and Fm. 7<sup>1</sup> are both in conditions.)

4) All the other occurrences of the optative of indirect discourse follow, grouped according to tense.

*Present tense.* *Ef þū þat lȳgr at hēr sē mōgr*, 'If you lie in saying that any son is here', Fj. 45; *ōll of røk fira vōromk* (= *varer mik*) *at viter*, Alv. passim. *þess geta menn at þar hafi*

verit Loki F. M. 5<sup>16</sup>; ek hins *get* . . . *at* ykr *típe* vega, Skm. 24<sup>4</sup>; eiþa *skaltu* . . . *vinna at* . . . *nē* brūpe mínne at bana *verþer*, Vkv. 35<sup>5</sup>; þess *vānter* mik at þēr *myne* ogn . . . *vesa*, Hym. 18<sup>3</sup>; eromk if ā þvī at aþtr *komak*, H. Hv. 33<sup>5</sup>; þvī at þat heita, at hlýpege *myne* (?), Hm. 23<sup>1</sup>.

*Preterite tense.* gat fyr Guþrūno at *være* grimmr Atla, Am. 83<sup>4</sup>; þat var enn mesti hēgōmi at Geirrøþr *væri* eigi matgōþr, Grm. 25; þat var trūa ī forneskju at menn *væri* endrbornīr, H. H. II. 50, pr. þat var trūa ī forneskju at orþ feigs manns *mætti* mikit, Fm. I. pr. 2; gāttesk þess at *være* grand svefna, Am. 20; sýndesk at *være* goll, Vkv. 21<sup>4</sup>. ef þū þat mant at þū þinn mōg *bæper* koma, Gg. I<sup>3</sup>; kvamtat af þinge es *vēr* þat frægem, at þū sōk *sōtter* *nē slōkper* aþra, Am. 95<sup>2</sup>; mer fyrmundo miner brōþr at *ættak* ver ollom fremra, Gþr. II. 3<sup>2</sup>.

5) The preterite future is expressed by *munda* and infinitive: svarar at hann *mundi* fā liþ Helga, H. Hv. 11, pr. 1; haþþak þat *ætlat* at *myndak* aldrege unna vaningja, Skm. 38<sup>3</sup>; hōn visse þat at vegenn *munde* Sigrlinnar sunr, H. Hv., 35<sup>3</sup>. The preterite future is found in implied indirect discourse in: Høgne þvī hlitte es hinn of *rēpe*, 'Hogne (said he) was satisfied with whatever Gunnar would decide', Am. 7<sup>4</sup>.

6) In the following the quotation is felt as implied in *bedja* (some would class these under 'attraction'): þann baþ slīta svefna mīnom es hverge lands hræþask *kynne*, 'Odin bid him break my sleep who never felt fear', Hlr. 9<sup>4</sup>; baþ hann flytja gōþa eina, ok þās ek gōrva *kunna*, Hrbl. 18.

The general rule for the use of the optative was laid down under *segja* and this rule will work roughly for all verbs sentiendi et declarandi. It is not all-sufficient however. Some of the words have formed habits of their own that are due to the predominant influence of their most usual associations. So *vita* has kept company with statements of fact in the indicative till it neglects to bestow an optative upon instances like: *hitke* hann *veit* . . . *at* hann *esa* vamma vanr, Hōv. 22<sup>3</sup>; *enge* þat *veit* at hann etke *kann*, 'no man knows that he knows naught,' Hōv. 27<sup>3</sup>; *Hyggja*, though it often contains a great degree of certainty, never takes the indicative. Perhaps it once expressed hope and intention as its cognates do in most of the dialects and at that time formed its habit of taking the optative. Such is its meaning and construction in: hitt ek hugþa at ek hafa *mynda* geþ hennan alt ok gaman, 'I hoped that I should have', Hōv. 98<sup>3</sup>.

Such forces as the friendship of words in stereotyped phrases, the pleasure that lies in certain collocations of sound, the mutual attraction of analogous constructions, and all the rest of them, must very often be successful in their attack upon the rules and distinctions unconsciously laid down by folk-logic. To consider any one power as wholly responsible for all the facts of a construction like that of indirect discourse is unscientific. This statement will have to serve in lieu of a thorough study of the construction, since the data furnished by the Edda are unfortunately too meagre for such work.

7) *Indirect questions.* Classified according to tense and leading verb.

*The present tense.* hitt viljak *vita* *hvē* Vafþrūðnes salakynne *sē* Vm. 3<sup>\*</sup>, 'I wish to know where V.'s house is'; hitt viljak fyrst *vita ef þū frōþr sēr*, Vm. 6<sup>3</sup>; *vita ef meine* morþfōr kono, Sg. 43<sup>4</sup>; *vittu ef hjalper*, Od. 4<sup>4</sup>; vill vist *vita* *hvat sēr*, Grp. 26; *vita* far *ef vilja mune*, Fj. 43<sup>3</sup>; at *fregna hveim* enn frōpe *sē* ofreiþe, afe, Skm. 1<sup>3</sup>; 2<sup>3</sup>; skal *freista hvaþarr* fleira *vite*, Vm. 9<sup>3</sup>; *spyrja* *hverr* sã maþr *sē*, Grp. 3<sup>2</sup>; *segðu* mér þat . . . *hvárt sē* manna, Fj. 21<sup>3</sup>; -*hvárt sē* matar, 23<sup>3</sup>; *sē* vãpna, 25<sup>3</sup>; *sē* mæta, 29<sup>3</sup>; *sē* manna, 41<sup>3</sup>; cf., in the same series, *kœmr*, Fj. 27, which is in the indicative: *segðu* . . . *hverr* jōtna elztr . . . *yrþe*, Vm. 28<sup>4</sup>; *segðu* þat . . . *hvī þū viter*, Vm. 42<sup>1</sup>.

*The preterite tense.* of þat *rēþo* ríker tívar *hvī være* Balldre baller draumar, 'The gods discussed why Balder had bad dreams', Vgtm. 1<sup>4</sup>; *rãþ* *hvat* þat *være*, Am. 21<sup>4</sup>; þã *frã* Grímhíldr . . . *hvar vērak* komen, Gpr. II. 17<sup>2</sup>; *frã* . . . *ef vilde* heim . . . fara, H. H. I. 17<sup>3</sup>; *frōgo ef vilde* . . . kaupa, Akv. 21<sup>3</sup>; *frétte* Atle *hvert* farner *være sveinar*, Am. 74<sup>3</sup>; *gættosk* *hverr* *hefþe* blaudet. Vsp. 25<sup>3</sup>; *skynjafi* *hvárt* *væri*, Fm. 31 pr.<sup>3</sup>; spurdo ef hann *være* . . . komenn epa *hefþi*, Hōv. 108<sup>4</sup>; spurdu ef eigi leiddiz Grt. 30; at *spyrja* *hverr* *vilde*, Gpr. II. 18<sup>23</sup>; hōn *frétte* at þvī, *hverr* fara *vilde* Gpr. II. 19<sup>3</sup>; hann visse þat vilge gōrla *hvat* hōnom *være* vinna sōmst, Sg. 13<sup>3</sup>. *Skylde* does service as a preterite-future optative: of þat *gættosk* *hverr* *skylde* dverga drōtt of skepja, Vsp. 9<sup>3</sup>, 'Tried to decide who should destroy the giant brood'; *frétto* *hvat* *skylde*, Am. 72<sup>6</sup>, 'Asked what they should do'; *hvárt*, *skyldak* vega, Sg. 38<sup>2</sup>; *leitafi* Reginn *rãpa* . . . *hvernig* hann *skyldi* heimta, Rm. 11. pr. 4; *gōrva* often serves as an auxiliary verb, as English *do*. In that sense it plays the part of a preterite-future in: beip hann sinnar . . . *kvãnar ef* hōnom of koma *gōrþe*.

Vkv. 7<sup>4</sup>. The following is also a past-future, being apparently a question of deliberation in a dependent clause: of þat rēþo ríker tívar hvē Hlōrriþa hamar of sōtte þrk. 13<sup>4</sup>.

The rule given for the moods of indirect discourse applies to indirect questions. The caution there called for is even more necessary here, as distinctions are harder to draw. Thus after *vita* we find 22 indicatives to 7 optatives, after *spyrja* 2: 4, while after *fregna* and *frétta* only optatives (8). If one takes the connectives, the results are similar. The ratio of indicatives to optatives with *hvar* is 17: 1; with *hvārr*, 7: 3; with *hvat*, 16: 6; with *hvē*, 16: 2; with *hverr*, 10: 7.

8. *Causal clauses with þvī at, af þvī at, fyr þvī at.* The indicative seems to be the regular mood. It is found five times in sentences like: Sigurþr dulþi nafns síns *fyrer þvī at þat var trúa þeira* i forneskju, 'He concealed his name because it was their belief' Fm. 1. The optative occurs twice in giving a rejected reason: hlāra þū af þvī . . . at þēr gōþs vite, 'You do not laugh, because this brings you advantage.' Sg. 31<sup>3</sup>; hnēkat af þvī til hjalpar þēr at vārer þess verþ, 'I did not help you because you ever deserved it', Od. 9<sup>2</sup>. The optative occurs twice in quoting a reason that is given as the cause for reproof. The clause is halfway between a substantive of indirect discourse and an adverb of cause: þvī brā mer Guþrūn . . . at Sigverþe svāfak ā arme, 'Guþrūn reproached me because I slept in S.'s arms', Hlr. 13<sup>2</sup>; þvī bregþr þū nū mēr Fāfner at til fjarre seak, Fm. 8<sup>1</sup>. I am inclined to think that at the time of the Edda no definite type of the optative would be recognized as causal, aside from examples of indirect discourse. Delbrück says for Germanic: "dass im urgermanischen ein fester typus für die causalsätze nicht vorhanden war, ausser vielleicht bei fragendem hauptsatz". p. 247. The facts furnished by the Eddas do not contribute to the confirmation or denial of that exception.

9. *Consecutive clauses with at, svāt.*

The indicative is found in a large majority of cases, especially when the result is viewed simply as a fact. See Gering under *at*, p. 75, and *svā*, 1003. Again Delbrück lays down the ever-recurring distinction between 'tatsächlichkeit' and 'vorstellung'. Something more definite ought to be attainable. At present I can only give the data and point out that the examples of the optative fall into *two* general groups.

1) Not only is it impossible to draw a sharp line between final and consecutive clauses, but many of the latter kind are steeped in the feeling of purpose. As there is a budding result in intention, there is a reminiscence of the intention in the full bloom of result. That statement is at least accurate enough to describe the processes of the folk-logic that creates syntax. At any rate, be the logic what it may, the ruts and grooves along which jog the fixed phrases of purpose and result are very often the same. It is not strange then to find in some languages the mood of purpose in the clause of result: cf. 'He that smiteth a man *so that* he *die* shall be surely put to death'. Ex. 21, 12. This is particularly the case when the main clause is itself an expression of will and thereby so loaded with intention that the result clause assumes part of the burden. The first group then consists of result clauses whose mood is probably due to the *volitive* tone, and this usually comes from an imperative or expression of will, desire, obligation and the like, in the main clause.

2) The second group, particularly with negative antecedents, readily associates itself with the *potential* optative. This is true of the relative as well as of the adverbial consecutive clauses: *esat svā maþr hōr at pik af heste take*, Vkv. 39<sup>3</sup>, evidently means 'There is no man so tall that he *can* take you', cf. *sitr eige hēr snōr nē dōtter sūs Guþrūno gæfe hnossar*, 'There are here neither daughter nor daughter-in-law who could give her pleasure', Ghv. 19<sup>4</sup>. Of the older languages Latin is the only one that has this construction more fully developed. There the connection with the potential, and the 'would' potentials in particular, seems even more evident. In Old-Norse it must be remembered that the present tense of the potential is exceedingly rare. Perhaps it was once in use as in the older languages, and at that stage it may have revealed a closer connection with the consecutive clauses than can now be found in the Eddas.

1) The following result clauses make up the first mentioned group. They usually depend closely upon expressions of will: *vesattu svā ōr at ein farer*, 'be not so foolish as to go alone', H. H. II. 50<sup>1</sup>; *verþet maþr svā tryggr at þesso true*, 'one should not be so simple as to believe these', Hōv. 88<sup>4</sup>; *Segðu þat svāt þū einoge fete ganger framarr*, 'Tell me before you go a step' (so that you do not go a step first), Ls. 1<sup>2</sup>; *kōstet svā at klökkve*, Am. 54<sup>3</sup>; *svā skyldet at nē striddet*, Hm. 8<sup>4</sup>; *skallatu svāt lyke*, Hōv. 112<sup>5</sup>; *Hōn svā gører at þū gaer eige*, Hōv. 113.

2) The following are probably more closely related to the potential. The negative appears in the main clause. *esat maþr svā gōþr at galle nē fylge, nē svā illr at einoge duge*, Hōv. 132<sup>3-4</sup>; 'There is no man so good that evil does not touch him, nor so bad that he is nothing worth'; *flygra hann svā stint at ek stopvegak*, Hōv. 150<sup>3</sup>; *brinnrat svā breitt at ek hōnom bjargegak*, Hōv. 152<sup>3</sup>; *fankak mann svā matargōþan at vǽret þiggja þeget, eþa sīns fear svāge . . . at leip sē laun þegan*, Hōv. 40<sup>2</sup>; *þatke at þū hafer brōkr þīnar*, Hrbl. 12; *hvārke þū þā þorþer fīsa . . . svāt F. heyrþe*, Hrbl. 80; *esat svā maþr hōr at þik af heste take, nē svā oflogr at þik neþan skjōte*, Vkv. 39<sup>4</sup>; *engi var svā sterkr at dregit gæti*, Grt. 18; *verþat svā rīk skop at Regenn skyle . . . bera*, Fm. 39<sup>1</sup>; *hykkak svā mikla vesa at þu mēr nē seger*, Skm. 5<sup>2</sup>; *hykkak okr vesa . . . at vit mynem sjalfer of sakask*, Hm. 29<sup>2</sup>.

The following differ somewhat from the above: *björn hriste svā hramma at vēr hrædd yrþem*, Am. 16<sup>2</sup>; cf. *mættem*, Am. 16<sup>3</sup>. I have classed these under indirect discourse (cf. p. 25). *þat eitt es svā matar at þeim menn of gefe ok hlaupe inn meþan þeir eta*, Fj. 24<sup>4</sup>, is practically a verbatim quotation of an indirect question from the preceding stanza. *sagpi þat mark ā, at engi hundr var svā ōlmr at ā hann mundi hlaupa*, Grm. 24. Here *mundi* serves as a preterite-future.

The indicative except in the two above-mentioned classes is the regular mood and occurs in a large majority of the consecutive clauses.

10. *Relative Clauses.* When the *relative* clause *determines* the antecedent, the indicative is used as in other languages. *Sā enn stōrūþge jōtonn es ōr steine vas hōvopet ā*, 'saw a huge giant who had a head of stone', Hrbl. 34. *Generic* relative clauses are also in the indicative in the Edda; *at augabragþe verþr sās etke kann*, 'he becomes a laughing-stock who knows nothing', Hōv. 5<sup>3</sup>. In the affirmative characterizing clause with indefinite antecedent the indicative is regular. *Vōlundr var settir ī hōlm einn er þar var fyr landi* 'was placed on an island that was near the land,' Vkv. 18<sup>2</sup>.

1) The optative however is found in all of these relative clauses when volition and desire are very evident: *mar gefþū mēr þā þanns mik of myrkvan bere vīsan vafroga ok þat sverþ es sjalfit vegesk*, 'give me the horse that will bear me and the sword that will fight of itself', Skm. 8; *baþ Sifjar ver sēr fōra hver, þanns, ōllom yrþ ōl of heitak*, "asked Thor to bring him a cauldron

'in which I can brew ale for all' ", Hym. 3<sup>2</sup>; hvat mon snōt . . . mæla *es* at farnaþe fylke *verþe*? Grp. 16<sup>4</sup>; farþu nū þars þik *hæfe* allan gramer, Hrbl. 145; farþu nū þarer smyl *hæfe* þik, Grm. 12; ligg i fjörbrotom þars þik Hel *hæfe*, (almost independent), Fm. 21<sup>4</sup>; letea maþr hana langrar göngo þars aþrborenn aldre *verþe*, 'Let her go whence she will never return', Sg. 45<sup>3</sup>.

2) As in the result clauses so here there is evidently a definite type made up of consecutive clauses that follow a negative antecedent. They are all clauses of character, after indefinite antecedents: vætr *es* þat manna *es* *knege* ā . . . arme sofa, 'There is now one who may sleep in her arms,' Fj. 42<sup>1</sup>; lāteþ *enge mann* eþter sitja *es* benlogom bregþa *kunne*, 'Let no man sit idle who knows how to use the flaming sword', H. H. I. 53<sup>5</sup>; mæaltera þū þat māl *es* mik meirr *trege*, nē þik *viljak* verr of nīta, Vkv. 39<sup>12</sup>; hōn ser visse etke grand, vamm þats *være* eþa vesa hygþe, Sg. 5<sup>3</sup>. The following in the potential optative may show how that could have found a path to such as the above quoted: sitr eige hēr snōr nē dōttr *sūs* Guþrūno *gæfe* hnossar. 'There are here neither daughter-in-law nor daughter who could give (or, to give) her pleasure', Ghv. 19<sup>4</sup>; goll vissak etke ā Gnitaheþe þats vit *ættema* annat jaþnmiket, 'I knew of no gold at Gniteheath but that we would (prove to) have an equal amount,' Akv. 6<sup>4</sup>.

a.) The optative is also found in a few adverbial and adjectival clauses that restrict or define the class of the antecedent: hann var hogastr maþr svā at menn vite i fornum sōgum, 'He was the most skillful man so far as men know', Vkv. 15 (note the superlative, and *svā at*); faþer vastattu fenresulfa ollum ellre svāt ek muna, 'so far as I remember', H. H. I. 42<sup>1</sup>; ranna þeira *es* ek rept *vīla* mīns veitk mest magar, 'of houses that I know my son's is the largest', Grm. 24<sup>4</sup>; fār vas fremre sās fold rype, Rm. 26<sup>3</sup>; kvamat af þinge *es* vēr þat frægem, 'You never came from court of which we heard that . . .', (perhaps this belongs with the characterizing clauses with negative antecedents), Am. 95<sup>1</sup>.

#### 11. "Attractio modorum."

Sometimes, not often, when a clause is found closely attached to another clause which stands in the optative of will, wish, possibility or indirect discourse, its verb will adopt the mood of the main clause; partly because it assumes the tone of the main verb, partly because, being attached to a verb that stands in the



mood of non-reality, it too is necessarily felt to lie in the field of non-reality.<sup>1</sup>

1. In dependence upon verbs in the optative of will and wish: *urþar lokor halde þær ǫllom megom es þū ā sinnom sēr*, Gg. 7<sup>3</sup>. The state implied in *sēr* becomes hypothetical through the lack of certainty implied in the mood of *halde*. If the main clause had been indicative the subordinate verb would not have shown such nervousness. In the next, the negative increases the hypothetical tone. *Skriþea þat skip es und þær skriþe*, H. H. II. 30<sup>1</sup>; *rinnea sã marr es und þær rinne*, ib. 30<sup>3</sup>; *bitea þat sverþ es þū bregþer*, ib. 31<sup>3</sup>; *skriþe* necessarily becomes almost a concession to the imagination when the same act is prohibited in the main clause.

2. Here the dependent clause is hypothetical since it shares the attitude of a verb that expresses an 'unreal' wish: *sea þat mættak*, at Guþrūn sēr nē ynþet 'would I could see Guthrun when in distress', Am. 54. The following are strictly speaking examples of oratio obliqua extended into the remoter parts of the quoted statement. I classify them here only because they will probably be looked for in this place: *ek strengþak heit þar ī mot at giptaz ǫngum þeim manni er hræþaz kynni*, 'I strongly opposed marrying any man who could fear', Sd. 4. pr. 11; *haun hafþi þess heit strengt at eiga þā konu er hann vissi vænsta*, H. Hv. 5. See others under implied indirect discourse. A few are similarly involved in indirect questions. *segðu . . . hvárt sē manna nekkvat þats mege inn koma*, 'Tell me whether there is any man who may enter,' Fj. 21<sup>3</sup>; so *gefe, hlaufe*, ib. 23<sup>4</sup>; *knege*, ib. 25<sup>3</sup>, 41<sup>3</sup>; *hafe*, 29<sup>3</sup>. *Modal attraction*, therefore, barely appears in the Edda, for these cases are very few in comparison with the large number of similar sentences that have kept the indicative. To the theory of this construction I have given some attention elsewhere: *Attraction of Mood*, etc., Chicago, 1904; *The Influence of the Infinitive*, etc., A. J. P., XXV, pp. 428-446.

TENNEY FRANK.

<sup>1</sup> Herein this construction differs from a similar one that frequently occurs in Greek and Latin, for in those languages the construction of "attraction" is not affected by the presence of a feeling of "non-reality".